

Date: Mon, 4 Jan 93 00:06:00 PST
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V93 #11
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest Mon, 4 Jan 93 Volume 93 : Issue 11

Today's Topics:

 10m AM
430 mhz band under th (now private/closed repeaters)
Atari Computer Ham Radio Nets
Halogen RFI
Online Repeater Directory! Watch For It!
question
VK2WI Weekly News, 27th December 1992
Wanted: ICOM 726 Mods

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 4 Jan 93 01:29:29 GMT
From: arizona.edu!MILORI.CCIT.ARIZONA.EDU!HENRYK@arizona.edu
Subject: 10m AM
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I understand that the 10 meter AM band is from 29.0 to 29.2 MHz, and also
know that a lot of people are using converted CB radios thereby "channelizing"
this mode into 19 or 20 channels with 10 kHz steps. My questions are:
What are the frequencies used? Is there a calling frequency?
CB radios have gaps in between channels... are CB radios generally modified
to use the upper channels to avoid this?

TNX
Henry Knoepfle
KB7NIE

Date: Mon, 4 Jan 1993 04:41:02 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!iat.holonet.net!
bwilkins@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: 430 mhz band under th (now private/closed repeaters)
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

gary@ke4zv.uucp (Gary Coffman) writes:
: In article <1993Jan3.003515.6665@elroy.jpl.nasa.gov> laborde@oak.Jpl.Nasa.Gov
(Gregory R. LaBorde) writes:

: >I am hesitant to use a u-wave transmitter in close proximity. I'm more likely
: >to go mobile or base with it. Tolerances at 1.2 GHz are much tighter, making
: >homebrew equipment harder to produce and "appliances" more expensive.

:
: Cellular phones use a similar part of the spectrum and there isn't any
: hard evidence that they fry yuppie brains. :-)

:
: Homebrew equipment is really quite easy too thanks to cheap MMICs and
: packaged mixers. Microstrip takes all the hard work out of building
: equipment for this frequency range. Making *lots* of power is tough,
: but antenna gain is so cheap at these frequencies there's very little
: reason to generate high power.

: Gary

:
I saw a comparison of osha or ansi standards concerning rf emmissions as a
health hazzard. Basically it indicated that a 7 watt 2meter handheld
transmission was similar to a 1 watt 1280 MHz . Is it possible that some
of these folks are dosing themselves on 2meters and then posting to this
news group ? :>

The true amateurs are indeed on the higher bands....they always have
been...and will probably have to move even higher to find places to
expariment.

--
Bob Wilkins n6fri voice 440.250+ 100pl san francisco bay area
bwilkins@holonet.net packet n6fri @ w6pw.#nocal.ca.usa.na

Date: Sat, 02 Jan 1993 11:47:32 -0500
From: usc!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!eff!news.oc.com!utacfd.uta.edu!rwsys!ricksys!
lawton!red.uucp!terry@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: Atari Computer Ham Radio Nets
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Two amateur radio nets exist for Atari computer users. The first and oldest is the Atari Micro Computer Net, Sundays at 10:00 CST on 14.325 Mhz. This net has been in operation since about 1982 and is associated with a formal group of Atari Computer enthusiasts.

The second and newer net is on 28.480 Mhz at 2:30 CST each Sunday afternoon. It is just starting and is oriented on Atari computers and internet/uucp Atari applications.

All are welcome to join. Regards, Terry.

--

DOMAIN: terry%red@lawton.lonestar.org (Terrence R. Redding)
UUCP: . . . !rwsys!lawton!red!terry (Terrence R. Redding)
PACKET: WB5LMJ @ WB5MJS.OK.USA.NA
Voice 405 536-8822, Ben's Place (Benjamin Franklin) BBS 536-6988 9p to 6a
PhD candidate, University of Oklahoma in Adult and Higher Education
Educational Advisor, American Radio Relay League
221 SW Crystal Hills Drive, Lawton, Oklahoma 73505

Date: Sun, 3 Jan 1993 23:47:53 GMT
From: esseye!jongsma@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Halogen RFI
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I bought one of those imported Halogen floor lamps over the holidays and am reasonably happy with it. There's just one problem: It has a built in dimmer that splatters all over the AM radio band.

I vaguely recall someone posting once about how these lamps could be modified to reduced the splatter. Does anyone have any suggestions?

Thanks,
Ken

--

Ken Jongsma
Smiths Industries
Grand Rapids, Michigan

jongsma@benzie.si.com
73115.1041@compuserve.com

Date: Mon, 4 Jan 1993 05:26:33 GMT

From: sdd.hp.com!spool.mu.edu!clark!pacifier!mikef@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Online Repeater Directory! Watch For It!
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I again request (plead) that, either in addition to or as a substitute for the Windows or NT version of the On-line Repeater Directory software, a version be built for MSDOS or in portable C without fancy pictures so that we blind amateurs could use it without hassles.

Thanks in advance.

--

Mike Freeman <K7UIJ>		Internet: mikef@pacifier.rain.com
301 N.E. 107th Street		or freeman@watsun.cc.columbia.edu
Vancouver, WA 98685 USA		GEne: M.FREEMAN11
Telephone (206)574-8221		I doubt, therefore I might be!

Date: 4 Jan 93 04:17:39 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: question
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In the past 10 years there was a great flurry of attempts at creating a "band-plan" for the 10 meter band in the US. There was a great deal of these efforts documented in 73 magazine. I was wondering if anyone knew the final outcome of this work. In other words, was a plan ever created that is still in place or us today? Does anyone know what its details are?

Sam Williams WB5YNI
internet: 76476.2327@compuserve.com

Distribution:
>INTERNET:info-hams@ucsd.edu

Date: 4 Jan 93 05:24:10 GMT
From: eram!dave@midway.uchicago.edu
Subject: VK2WI Weekly News, 27th December 1992
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <9212310933.aa02273@ingate.microsoft.COM>,
a-kevinp@microsoft.COM (Kevin Purcell, Rho) writes:

| I doubt its a fake ... one would be able to tell from the amount of EI
| activity on that day.

It's genuine - the article was written by an Irishman himself (whom also
composes the VK2 weekly broadcast).

| More power to IRTS elbow on making it to their diamond jubilee.

They're still babies, compared to the WIA. We hit 80 a couple of years ago.

--

Dave Horsfall (VK2KFU) VK2KFU @ VK2RWI.NSW.AUS.OC
dave@esi.COM.AU ...munnar!esi.COM.AU!dave

Date: Sun, 3 Jan 1993 21:07:36 -0500 (EST)
From: pa.dec.com!uu.psi.com!uucp@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Wanted: ICOM 726 Mods
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I am looking for mods for a ICOM 726 hf/50Mhz transceiver. I would appreciate
any info. or an FTP site where I can get the info.

Thanks in advance,

Rob Gallagher - N1CXH

Date: 4 Jan 93 02:01:50 GMT
From: eram!dave@midway.uchicago.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <4623.15.uupcb@ncoast.ORG>, <2584@eram.esi.COM.AU>,
<rrgd50-281292113249@222.5.80.3>
Subject : Re: Converting 49Mhz Toys to 6 meters

In article <rrgd50-281292113249@222.5.80.3>,
rrgd50@email.sps.mot.com (Chris Terwilliger) writes:

| Catalog Number: 60-4015
| Price : \$9.95

Gadzooks! The Australian version (55 MHz) is about AU\$50 !!!
No wonder Tandy (RS) have a reputation here for over-priced junk...

--

Dave Horsfall (VK2KFU)
dave@esi.COM.AU

VK2KFU @ VK2RWI.NSW.AUS.OC
...munnar!esi.COM.AU!dave

Date: Sun, 3 Jan 1993 18:46:11 GMT
From: swrinde!emory!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1992Dec30.062020.24365@ssc.com>, <1992Dec30.234200.11309@ke4zv.uucp>,
<1993Jan02.061145.6961@ssc.com>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: 430mhz band under th

In article <1993Jan02.061145.6961@ssc.com> tad@ssc.com (Tad Cook) writes:
>In article <1992Dec30.234200.11309@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
writes:

>>In article <1992Dec30.062020.24365@ssc.com> tad@ssc.com (Tad Cook) writes:
>>>

>>>Maybe the following has some bearing here:

>>>

>>>97.205 Repeater station.

>>>

>>> (c) Where the transmissions of a repeater cause harmful
>>>interference to another repeater, the two station licensees are
>>>equally and fully responsible for resolving the interference UNLESS
>>>THE OPERATION OF ONE STATION IS RECOMMENDED BY A FREQUENCY
>>>COORDINATOR AND THE OPERATION OF THE OTHER STATION IS NOT. In that
>>>case, the licensee of the non-coordinated repeater has primary
>>>responsibility to resolve the interference.

>>> (d) A repeater may be automatically controlled.

>>> (e) Ancillary functions of a repeater that are available to
>>>users on the input channel are not considered remotely controlled
>>>functions of the station. LIMITING THE USE OF A REPEATER TO ONLY
>>>CERTAIN USER STATIONS IS PERMISSIBLE.

>>>

>>>(CAPITALIZED EMPHASIS IS MINE)

>>

>>Two things to note here. First, section (c) only applies to interference
>>from one repeater to another repeater and says nothing about individual
>>non-repeater station transmissions.

>

>Ha! Please test this for us. Start operating simplex packet on
>the input of a local repeater. See if citing this rule does you any
>good at all.

>

>It won't.

You have that backwards, it won't do *you*, the repeater owner, any good because it only refers to interference between *repeater* stations. The applicable regulation for the case you state is 97.101(b) which says "No frequency will be assigned for the exclusive use of any station." As long as there is no *on going* QSO on the repeater that suffers interference by the simplex use, the simplex user is not in violation. Someone who comes on and attempts to "talk over" the packet transmission *would* be in violation for malicious interference. As someone else noted, transmitting simplex on a repeater input is inconvenient because to remain legal, the repeater output would also have to be monitored *first* to see if there is possible interference to an *on going* QSO through the repeater. Operating simplex on the output frequency is a better practice, but operating on the input is *not* a violation if the repeater is not otherwise in use at the time of commencement of simplex operation.

> Second, section (e) refers to
>>*ancillary* functions of repeaters and the ability to limit access to
>>those *ancillary* functions to certain user stations. This doesn't
>>address closed repeaters where the *primary* function of the repeater
>>is restricted.
>>
>
>
>You're confused. The ability of a licensee to limit access to
>his station is NOT confined to ancillary functions.

No, I'm not confused. It's true that a repeater operator can *always* vacate the frequency occupied by his repeater by turning it *off* when he doesn't want it to repeat a particular amateur's transmissions. But that's a separate issue. The right to *cease operations* is never questioned anywhere in the regulations. What the repeater operator *cannot* do is lay exclusive claim to any frequency by attempting to prohibit *any* licensed operator from transmitting on a frequency that is currently not in use.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				emory!ke4zv!gary@gatech.edu

Date: Sun, 3 Jan 1993 16:04:08 GMT
From: swrinde!emory!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <C06ys7.5po@iat.holonet.net>, <PHR.93Jan1224845@napa.telebit.com>, <1993Jan3.003515.6665@elroy.jpl.nasa.gov>

Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)

Subject : Re: 430 mhz band under th (now private/closed repeaters)

In article <1993Jan3.003515.6665@elroy.jpl.nasa.gov> laborde@oak.Jpl.Nasa.Gov (Gregory R. LaBorde) writes:

>In article <PHR.93Jan1224845@napa.telebit.com> phr@telebit.com (Paul Rubin) writes:

>>

>>I am uncomfortable with the idea of using these bands with portable

>>equipment because of the additional microwave exposure.

>

>Paul brings up a good point. I for one would like to get into 1.2 GHz more, but

>I am hesitant to use a u-wave transmitter in close proximity. I'm more likely

>to go mobile or base with it. Tolerances at 1.2 GHz are much tighter, making

>homebrew equipment harder to produce and "appliances" more expensive.

Cellular phones use a similar part of the spectrum and there isn't any hard evidence that they fry yuppie brains. :-)

Homebrew equipment is really quite easy too thanks to cheap MMICs and packaged mixers. Microstrip takes all the hard work out of building equipment for this frequency range. Making *lots* of power is tough, but antenna gain is so cheap at these frequencies there's very little reason to generate high power.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				emory!ke4zv!gary@gatech.edu

Date: Sun, 3 Jan 1993 19:02:51 GMT

From: swrinde!emory!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <8228@lib.tmc.edu>, <1992Dec30.114623.1@ttd.teradyne.com>, <1993Jan02.061920.7115@ssc.com>

Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)

Subject : Re: 430mhz band under th

In article <1993Jan02.061920.7115@ssc.com> tad@ssc.com (Tad Cook) writes:

>In article <1992Dec30.114623.1@ttd.teradyne.com> rice@ttd.teradyne.com writes:

>>
>>That's not what I said. What I said was that any Ham has the right by law
>>to transmit on any frequency for which he is liscensed. Period. The repeater
>>operator has the right to turn off the machine. Period.
>
>Let me see if I have this straight (!)..... :)
>
>I get my 440 MHz link set up, and get a coordinated frequency from
>the local coordination council. Everything works fine, until one
>day YOU show up and start transmitting there.
>
>And *I* have to turn off my gear??
>
>I don't think so!

Of course you don't *have* to turn off your receiver. But you may
have to listen to a QSO on *your* private frequency. 97.101(b)
says you don't own it.

Gary

```
--
Gary Coffman KE4ZV          | You make it,      | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems | we break it.     | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way            | Guaranteed!      | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244    |                   | emory!ke4zv!gary@gatech.edu
```

```
-----
Date: 4 Jan 93 02:15:50 GMT
From: eram!dave@midway.uchicago.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu
```

```
References <1992Dec29.064105.29463@pacifier.rain.com>,
<1992Dec30.142027.1@ualr.edu>, <randall.725765073@seashore>
Subject : Re: 11 Meters
```

```
In article <randall.725765073@seashore>,
    randall@informix.com (Randall Rhea) writes:
```

```
| Australia's 11 meter frequencies, modes, and output power are the
| same as for CB in the USA. It is a CB band there and in the USA.
```

Where do think Australian CB's come from? Same place that supplies
the Americans... Mind you, there was a fiasco over 23/18/40 channels;
the Govt of the day seemed to have been pressured by many groups, and
came up with incompatible band plans every year or so...

Oh, and CB callsigns are required, and renewed (NOT free) each year.

--

Dave Horsfall (VK2KFU) VK2KFU @ VK2RWI.NSW.AUS.OC
dave@esi.COM.AU ...munnar!esi.COM.AU!dave

Date: Mon, 4 Jan 1993 00:30:59 GMT
From: psinntp!sugar!jreese@uunet.uu.net
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jan02.200308.16355@eng.umd.edu>, <C0A7J9.7tL@NeoSoft.com>,
<1993Jan03.182401.749@eng.umd.edu>
Subject : Re: 430mhz band under th

In article <1993Jan03.182401.749@eng.umd.edu> chuck@eng.umd.edu (Chuck Harris - WA3UQV) writes:

>My drivers license allows me to drive on any highway, and my ham license
>allows me to transmit on any unoccupied ham frequency (within my class).
>If you don't want to have your repeater repeat my transmission, the FCC says
>that it is your right to turn your repeater off...Period!

I have never argued that an operator didn't have the right to transmit on my
input frequency...only that it is pretty rude to do it.

>That it is fun, is why you shouldn't be overly concerned if some of the
>unwashed masses use your repeater from time to time. After all, they are
>letting you put your repeater on THEIR frequencies.

Talking on it from time to time is one thing...being a regular user is
something else. I don't run off transient users, but if you live in Houston,
and the only reason you want to use my radio is to prove a point, you're
not welcome.

>The HF nets don't occupy a given frequency 24 hours a day, 365 days a year,
>your repeater does.

...but if I want to talk on 14.313 during the Maritime Mobile net, I can't do
it...what's the difference?

>We are all pleased that you are having fun. I just think it is inappropriate
>for your method of having fun to impact heavily on the fun of others.

How is my building repeaters for fun impacting the fun of others? If my radio
were never used, I might buy this, but it's one of the most active UHF systems
in town. Just because it's not a public utility doesn't make it a waste of
spectrum. Only if the channel isn't being used is the spectrum being wasted.

--

Jim Reese, WD5IYT | "Real Texans never refer to trouble
jreese@sugar.neosoft.com | as deep doo-doo" --Molly Ivins

Date: Mon, 04 Jan 1993 04:03:22 GMT
From: nwnexus!ole!ssc!tad@uunet.uu.net
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1992Dec30.233653.11068@ke4zv.uucp>, <1993Jan02.060703.6610@ssc.com>,
<1993Jan3.005747.7633@elroy.jpl.nasa.gov>
Subject : Re: 430mhz band under th

In article <1993Jan3.005747.7633@elroy.jpl.nasa.gov> laborde@oak.Jpl.Nasa.Gov
(Gregory R. LaBorde) writes:

>In article <1993Jan02.060703.6610@ssc.com> tad@ssc.com (Tad Cook) writes:

>>

>>Jammer idiots in LA have tried to use this argument to justify
>>their antics on 2 meters and have lost every time.

>

>The difference is that they are interfering with QSOs in progress. We are
>discussing transmissions on the input of a repeater that is not in use, if
>I am not mistaken?

>

HUH?? I must be mistaken then. I thought SURE that I was responding to
someone who was advocating operating simplex on top of the input of a
live, coordinated repeater....merely because it was not "open".

>

>

--

Tad Cook | Phone: 206-527-4089 (home) | MCI Mail: 3288544
Seattle, WA | Packet: KT7H @ N7DUO.WA.USA.NA | 3288544@mcimail.com
| Internet: tad@ssc.com | or...sumax!ole!ssc!tad

Date: Mon, 04 Jan 1993 03:59:12 GMT
From: nwnexus!ole!ssc!tad@uunet.uu.net
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1992Dec28.235602.1@ttd.teradyne.com>, <8228@lib.tmc.edu>,
<1993Jan02.200308.16355@eng.umd.edu>#

Subject : Re: 430mhz band under th

In article <1993Jan02.200308.16355@eng.umd.edu> chuck@eng.umd.edu (Chuck Harris - WA3UQV) writes:

>In article <1992Dec28.235602.1@ttd.teradyne.com> rice@ttd.teradyne.com writes:
>>Excuse Me ? "Invited" to use the spectrum. Where does the FCC say that ANY
>>Amateur has to be INVITED to transmit on a frequency? This kind of attitude
>>is a good part of What's wrong with ham radio today. Some people think they
>>have a god given right to a portion of the spectrum. It's theirs - they
>>paid for it - an no one's going to take it away from them. Pure unadulterated
>>BULLSHIT.

>

>In article <8228@lib.tmc.edu> jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:
>>This kind of attitude is a good part of What's wrong with ham radio today.
>>Some people think they have a god given right to use other people's equipment.
>>It's using ham spectrum and they can use it if they damned well please. Pure
>>unadulterated BULLSHIT.

>>

>>Your argument boils down to "If they want to spend \$10K on a sophisticated
>>repeater system, they have to make it a public utility". There are two

>

>If you want to park your \$10K machine on a public frequency, then you should
>expect it to be used as a public utility. If you are not expecting that,
>then you should move out of the way so that others can use the frequency.

But this assumes that there is only ONE appropriate use for our VHF/UHF
freqs....open FM voice repeaters!

One of the goals of good frequency coordination is to insure that
spectrum as used for a VARIETY of purposes....links, open repeaters,
closed repeaters, packet, ATV, radio control, etc.

>

>This "I own the frequency" crap IS the largest problem with Ham radio today.
>Nothing compels you to put up a repeater. You do so, in part out of public
>service, in part out technical interest, and in part out of stroking your own
>ego. Nothing wrong with that. The rest of the Ham community puts up with your
>hogging of the frequency with your repeater because it expects to be able to
>use it from time to time when it wishes to, or needs to.

Nope! This only applies to SOME of the types of uses that spectrum
is coordinated for.

>

>No one expects to use your autopatch for free; so control your access codes.
>If you find that someone spends a great deal of time on your machine, remind
>that person that it costs a lot of money to run a repeater, and you can use
>all the help you can get, but don't expect to be able to force that individual

>to pay. This is not a commercial venture. If you still can't deal with your
>"great act of charity", then take your repeater down, and let someone else use
>the allocation. There are plenty of hams out there who would love to put up an
>open repeater on your pair!
>

If the closed repeater annoys you so much, then go use an open one.

>
>

--

Tad Cook		Phone: 206-527-4089 (home)		MCI Mail: 3288544
Seattle, WA		Packet: KT7H @ N7DUO.WA.USA.NA		3288544@mcimail.com
		Internet: tad@ssc.com		or...sumax!ole!ssc!tad

Date: Mon, 4 Jan 1993 04:52:45 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!eos!aio!gothamcity!
gcreager@network.UCSD.EDU
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <C05L02.15s@iat.holonet.net>, <1i0dkmINNk2s@network.ucsd.edu>,
<1993Jan1.151157.23852@ke4zv.uucp>p
Subject : Re: 430 mhz band under th (now private/closed repeaters)

In article <1993Jan1.151157.23852@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
writes:
>In article <1i0dkmINNk2s@network.ucsd.edu> brian@ucsd.edu (Brian Kantor) writes:
>>One of the repeater/remote systems I've recently built consists of
>>80-6m SSB, 6, 2, 220, 440, and 1200 MHz duplex fm transceivers, a
>>control system with 5 microprocessors, a telephone interface, remote
>>antenna switching, power control, battery power, and building security
>>system.
>>
>>This kind of a system must inherently remain closed simply because of
>>the training required to operate it properly. Yes, it's possible to
>>damage it if you tell it to do the wrong things.
>
>Sounds like you haven't done the control system properly if it can
>be damaged by a user command.

Bzzzzzzzzzzzt. Wrong answer. The technologist is NOT responsible for user
stupidity, and NOWHERE in the rules, nor in my dog-eared Operating Practices
ca. 1967 is anything about making software so "user friendly" that it's
intuitively obvious to the most casual twit!

Gerry Creager n5jxs
gcreager@gothamcity.jsc.nasa.gov

Date: Mon, 4 Jan 1993 01:05:18 GMT
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!ennews!mcdphx!schuch@network.UCSD.EDU
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <9301011837.AA05064@emx.cc.utexas.edu>,
<1993Jan2.082423.27045@phx.mcd.mot.com>, <1993Jan3.063925.27293@sequent.com>
Subject : Re: Hot Rigs, was: Radio Robbery

>>I know the feeling, I had my Yeasu FT-727R ripped off some time ago.
>>
>>I've always thought there should be some clearing house for the serial
>>numbers of stolen equipment. We all look for great deals on used
>
>There is !
>It called the police dept. Call your local cop shop, tell them you are
>about to purchase a Blarvitz model 10 Serial 1234 and ask them to check
>it out (tips and leads database)
>

Are they connected nationally? I understand that most property stolen
here (Phoenix) ends up in L.A.. I envision a system dedicated to ham
radio equipment and related electronics, that would be simple and fast
to use from anywhere in the U.S.. I just don't know how it would be
subsidized.

John

--
+-----+
| John R. Schuch - Motorola Computer Group - Manufacturing Engineering |
| N7XVS - schuch@phx.mcd.mot.com - (602) 438-3008 - CompuServe: 70733.3330 |
+-----+

End of Info-Hams Digest V93 #11
